

## REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2007, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire April 25, 2007. A one-month extension of time is requested, thereby allowing Applicant to respond by May 25, 2007.

### Claims 1-6 are patentable over Logvinov and Dollard

Claim 1, as amended, now recites, "generating a pilot mask in the receiver based solely on analysis at the receiver". Applicant respectfully submits that neither Logvinov nor Dollard teach this limitation.

Logvinov teaches that the receiver gathers channel data during periods when transmitters occupy the channel as well as times when the channel is idle. Paragraph 0016. Channel data from the transmitter the receiver is communicating with as well as other transmitters can also be used. Paragraph 0039. The same approach is applicable for determining the presence of narrow and wide band interferers. Paragraph 0043. Logvinov uses the gathered data to improve receiver effectiveness and avoid interference. Paragraphs 0016 and 0043. Dollard generates a bitmap that is indicative of usable and unusable sub-carriers based on analysis at the transmitter and then sends that bitmap to the receiver. Col. 5, lines 39-52.

In Applicant's method, the pilot mask can be generated based only on analysis at the receiver. This method is more efficient than Logvinov (technique uses analysis from transmitter and receiver) or Dollard (technique uses analysis from transmitter).

Because Logvinov and Dollard fail to disclose or suggest the recited step of generating or appreciate its advantages,

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on those reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-5.

Claim 6, as amended, now recites, "a set of flags generated in the receiver based solely on analysis at the receiver". Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable for substantially the same reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on those reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 6.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application.  
Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the  
undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this  
case.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 30547



Jeanette S. Harms  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 35,537